United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

No. 20-50749 Summary Calendar April 16, 2021 Lyle W. Cayce

Clerk

-

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

ELENO GUILLEN-MORALES,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. 4:20-CR-217-1

Before Higginbotham, Jones, and Costa, *Circuit Judges*. Per Curiam:*

Eleno Guillen-Morales pleaded guilty to illegal reentry after removal, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. He was sentenced to a 37-month term of imprisonment, to be followed by a three-year term of supervised release.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-50749

Raising one issue on appeal, Guillen-Morales argues that the recidivism enhancement under § 1326(b) is unconstitutional in light of *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), and subsequent decisions because it allows a sentence above the otherwise applicable statutory maximum based on facts that are neither alleged in the indictment or found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Guillen-Morales concedes that this argument is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224, 226-27 (1998), but seeks to preserve the issue for further review. The Government, agreeing that the issue is foreclosed, has filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance. In the alternative, the Government requests an extension of time to file a brief.

As the Government argues, and Guillen-Morales concedes, the sole issue raised on appeal is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres*. See United States v. Wallace, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014); United States v. Pineda-Arrellano, 492 F.3d 624, 625-26 (5th Cir. 2007). Because the issue is foreclosed, summary affirmance is appropriate. See Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969).

Accordingly, the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, the Government's alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.